

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are presently in the application. Claim 1 has been amended for clarity. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed, such as in paragraphs [0022] and [0023]. No new subject matter has been added.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Baertsch et al. (US Patent No. 6,470,071) This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, clearly indicates that the sequence of commands, provided to the privileged mode and to be executed in real time, is provided to at least one CPU running the non real time operating system, and that the commands are initiated one at a time, by the at least one CPU, for execution. In contrast, Baertsch et al. describe storing the commands on a hardware device (the Detector Framing Node (DFN)) and having the hardware device execute the sequence of commands in batch autonomously after the Host sends a “begin” command. This is evidenced by the passage found in column 14 at lines 48-54, where it states that “Event sequence 312 is initiated by sending a Begin Sequence command over computer communication bus 302. The extent of real-time control allotted to host computer 114 is confined to a determination of when event sequence 312 will begin. Subsequently, host computer 114 is completely removed from image acquisition”. It is important to note the distinction between the DFN device driver and the DFN hardware device in Baertsch et al. The device driver is only a tunnel in the operating system to send the list of commands in advance and write them in the hardware for later execution. Therefore, it should be understood that Baertsch et al. fail to teach or suggest at least the steps of “providing from said at least one application said sequence of commands to a privileged mode of said non real time operating system to be executed in real time” and “initiating one at a time, using the at least one CPU, execution of each of said commands from said stored sequence of commands”.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection against claims 1-2 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baertsch et al. in view of Dingwall et al. (US 5,903,752).

Dingwall et al. does not address the deficiencies of Baertsch provided above. In addition, the statement in Baertsch regarding the lack of involvement of the host computer CPU with respect to image acquisition is a clear teaching away from any modification that would have the host computer CPU perform the steps recited in the present claims. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3-14 be withdrawn.

Conclusions

It is believed that Claims 1-14 are allowable over the prior art and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Michel Doyon et al.

By:

/ALEXANDRA DAOUD/

Alexandra Daoud  
Registration No 55,992  
Customer Number: 020988